

THE CALCUTTA JOURNAL,

OF

Politics and General Literature.

VOL. II.]

SATURDAY, MARCH 16, 1822.

[No. 65.]

MISCELLANEOUS.

—157—

General Summary.

Two Arrivals were announced yesterday from Sea, one from the Cape of Good Hope and Madras, and the other from New South Wales. Three Departures were mentioned in the same Report, one for the Isle of France, another for South America, and a third for China. The details will be found, as usual, under the Shipping head, in our last page.

The BOMBAY and MADRAS Papers came in by the Dawn of yesterday, but they furnish no local intelligence, and their European News is not of a later date than our own. We turn, therefore, to the general topics of the day; after a few words that we shall find it necessary to offer in mere self-defence.

The modest HIBERNICUS, who, like Sir William Draper defending the character of Lord Granby against Junius, is conscious of "the advantage which he possesses over his opponent" from "superior literary attainments," though he hopes he "may not be mistaken as aiming at comparisons,"—is not satisfied, it seems, with all that has been said on Irish Adulation, but wishes to prolong the discussion, as if he felt no ordinary pleasure therein. In the BULL of yesterday, among much irrelevant matter, he says,—"With the warmth of an Irishman I endeavoured to defend the well-known hospitality of Ireland against the *shurs* of a Journalist" &c. This was really a needless task, as the said Journalist never once doubted or attacked the "well-known hospitality" so unnecessarily defended. He only doubted, as he still doubts, the assertions of certain Irish Writers that the King's presence was to relieve and redress all the grievances under which Ireland labours; and we believe that most sensible Irishmen will think as we do, that such an idea is extravagant and absurd. He says also "I am no literary hack." We may reply "Neither are we." He says, we attempted to insult and ridicule the Irish nation;—but to use his own phrase, this is a "cock and a bull story" which no one will believe. He says "the King's visit to Ireland held forth the symbol of peace," but that "the white flag was bespattered with the *filth* of the Times." If there was a white flag it was surely unnecessary where there was no existing war;—and "bespattering with filth" is not an amusement in which the TIMES ever indulges. It is perhaps more free from such an imputation than any Paper in England; unless the sound argument and close reasoning of that Paper be deemed "*filth*," when directed against authority; and the most slanderous imputations of JOHN BULL and the COURIER be taken to be wit and good humour when used against those in *disfavour* with that authority. But we must give the conclusion of the Letter of HIBERNICUS, at length, in order that such of our Readers as do not see the BULL, may judge of its style and tenor, and may see that we do not suffer "Civil Questions" to be asked of us without giving equally Civil Replies.—It is this,—

"But he knows himself, he is quite sure of that. Without the knowledge he boasts of, I will try to make him discover himself by interrogatories? I will put the questions civilly however, though without much hopes of a fair reply. Was the "Editor" of the "CALCUTTA JOURNAL" actuated by "malignant influence" when on the approach of St. Patrick's day, in another quarter of the world, he tried to ridicule the whole Irish nation. Was there any "*dislike for discord*" shewn in all this, or was it not "*dissimulation and hypocrisy clothed in smiles*?" Was it "*sincerity*" for his paper to turn one day with applauses to a Sovereign, and the

next to daringly dissent upon that Sovereign's political opinions? But I fear, Mr. Bull, I have been mistaken all this while, and have wreaked my vengeance on a man who trusted too deeply in my honour and honesty—I have met with a friend and for love knocked him down. No No! The Editor has only stuck fast upon a point, which is so slippery, that he won't speedily regain his equilibrium? Should I however by fair reasoning be able to stagger him in his sentiments of the Irish nation, I will consider any change a miracle that will shew the slightest symptoms of amendment."

To these Civil Questions, we offer the following Replies: whether they will be deemed "fair" ones by HIBERNICUS, we know not; but he will admit, we hope, that they are explicit at least:—

1st.—That the Editor of the CALCUTTA JOURNAL was not actuated by "malignant influence;"—and never attempted to "ridicule the whole Irish nation;"—but only that *infinitely small* portion of it, which attempted to idolize the King, as if he were a demi-god, and not a fellow-mortal—

2nd.—That so far from desiring to create discord on the approach of St. Patrick's Day, his pages were the first that contained an expression of a hope, that, "more unanimity might be found amongst those of the Island he converted than was evinced on a late occasion in celebrating the Anniversary of the Patron Saint of a portion of the Island of Great Britain;"—and the Song which followed this (p. 57) in praise of the Irish character, might have shown at least that nothing was farther from his wish than to throw a damp of any kind on the perfect enjoyment of the approaching Festival.

3rd.—That we perceive no want of "sincerity" whatever in giving place to the applauses bestowed by others on any individual on one day,—and discussing his political opinions on the next—What is meant by the phrase "*daringly dissent*" we do not clearly understand, unless it will be thought impious or profane to say any thing on so sacred a subject. As we do not yet reckon George the Fourth among the Gods, we think his political opinions as fit a subject of discussion, as those of any other mortal: but we believe, if HIBERNICUS would turn again to the page (73) he appears to have in view; he would find it was said by a London Writer that "the King, far from ever giving any proof of a desire to forward the only measure that can remove civil discord from Ireland (Catholic Emancipation we presume) has so little interested himself in state concerns, that the bulk of the people are to this day ignorant of his Majesty's political opinions." If it be "*daringly dissenting*" on a subject to say one knows nothing about it whatever, it must be in an Irish sense that the words are to be taken; for in plain English, to confess total ignorance of a matter, and to dissent upon it, are two very different things.

Whether we have "regained our equilibrium" or been "staggered in our sentiments of the Irish Nation" by the "fair reasoning" of HIBERNICUS, the Public must decide. But it is hardly fair in this ingenious Writer, when the age of miracles is admitted to be past, to expect even the "slightest symptoms of an amendment" which in his eyes he confesses would be "a miracle indeed!" So, also, we think, would be any thing like candid argument from the quarter he has chosen for his productions, and therefore we never look for it, being satisfied with the truth of this axiom at least, "Blessed is he that expects nothing;—for he shall not be disappointed."

Mr. Waithman and Lord Bathurst.—A Letter from Mr. Sheriff WAITHMAN to Lord BATHURST, on the subject of the resistance offered the Civil Authority of the County by the soldiery at Knightsbridge Barracks, will be found in another column. The country will look forward with the deepest anxiety to the answer which his Lordship may return to this Letter. Much will depend on that answer. The circumstances communicated by the Sheriff are of that nature, that human ingenuity cannot furnish his Lordship with even a pretext for evading the consideration of them. A direct conflict has taken place between the civil authority and a portion of the army, and Ministers must range themselves either on the side of the soldiery, or on the side of the laws. We almost tremble to think of the consequences which may result from their decision.

The circumstances which took place between Tuesday the 14th and Sunday last, were already but too much calculated to fill all who have any regard for our Constitution with alarm. A claim was set up and acted on by Ministers to withdraw the soldiery from responsibility to the laws of the country. There were no means, it was said, of ascertaining the names of the soldiers employed in any particular affair. The Commanding Officer possessed no information on this subject, the Adjutant knew only the names of the Officers, no list was kept by any one of the names of the soldiers. When soldiers, therefore, are brought to act illegally against the people, there is no means of identifying them and bringing them to trial. If their conduct affords satisfaction to the Ministers for the time, they can have nothing to fear from any other quarter, for there is no individual from whom the names of the persons implicated can be obtained, and Ministers have claimed the power of allowing none to enter their fortresses or barracks but such persons as they choose, and at such times and manner as they choose. The order which Colonel CAVENDISH gave the military to do their duty against the Coroner's Jury which ventured to approach the Barracks, was an expressive way of intimating to the people, the opinion of Ministers with respect to these sacred spots.

But dreadful as the idea of such a claim of impunity is to every person who has any regard for the Constitution of the Country, it shrinks into nothing when compared with the open resistance made on Sunday to the civil power. Not content with fortifying themselves in their Barracks, as spots sacred from the law, the soldiery would seem to have resolved to show that they were every where the masters.—The Commanding Officer (Colonel LYONS, we believe) thought proper not merely to refuse obedience to the request of the Sheriff, but to convey a message to him that he *might be damned*. A soldier, after having first deliberately taken a cartridge out of his pouch, and primed and loaded his carbine, was seen to place it against his shoulder and to take deliberate aim at the Sheriff, whom he could not have failed to shoot, if his carbine had not been knocked out of his hands by a Sheriff's officer. This deliberate outrage was unfortunately by no means an insulated act. Whilst engaged in separating the soldiers and the people, "a soldier," says the Sheriff, "with whom I had before been expostulating, and who was therefore acquainted with my official station, started forward at a man and knocked him down. At the same time, whilst using my utmost endeavours to prevail upon the soldiers to retire into the Barracks, and upon the people to desist and keep the peace, the bridle of my horse was violently seized by a young officer in undress, and on the other by the soldier whose violence I had just noticed, who together endeavoured to throw my horse over the causeway."

Respecting the nature of this transaction there cannot be two opinions. If Ministers are prepared to approve of it—if they think with the Journal which is supposed to speak their sentiments, that the conduct of the military on this occasion was free from blame—that the message of the Commanding Officer was such as it became an officer to send to the highest civil authority of the county—that the insults offered to Mr. WAITHMAN, personally, by officers and soldiers, were excusable—that the deliberate attempt to assassinate him was not "*very blamable*"—the people of this country may consider themselves as completely under a Military Government as the people of Russia are.

An attempt was made by THE COURIER to confound this affair with the proceedings which took place nearly an hour afterwards, and of which notice was taken on Monday at Marlborough-street. On the latter occasion, the Riot Act was read within the Barracks, and some constables stationed within rushed out and seized some of the mob. To endeavour to persuade the country that the soldiers who rushed out of the Barracks, sword in hand, against the people, when the resistance was offered to the Sheriff, were the peace officers who afterwards rushed out, was no doubt considered a praiseworthy piece of ingenuity.

But these artifices are lost upon the people of this country—SIR WILLIAM CURTIS may deem it necessary to apologize for his countrymen at Dublin—They certainly have some qualities which are not calculated to render them favourites with Courts or with Courtiers. They are apt to be cool and reflecting, and unwilling to surrender their understandings blindly to the guidance of others.—The information possessed by the middling ranks of this country, and especially of this metropolis, in such, that it is no easy matter to practise deception on them. An Englishman may well be proud, when he witnesses the ability and judgment displayed in critical conjunctures at the two Inquests, by so many men taken at hazard from the people. The dignified reproof addressed on Monday by Mr. BLACKIE to Colonel CAVENDISH, is one of numerous instances in point.

Military Interference.—The COURIER, who, from the apologist for military interference, appears to have become the unblushing advocate for military rule, seems to have completely forgotten, even the existence of Civil Authorities, except as they may occasionally give an air of legality to slaughter, by reading the Riot Act. Observing that Mr. WAITHMAN foresaw that quarrels might arise on the return of the mourners from Hammersmith, he comments thus on the judicious and intrepid conduct of that Gentleman:—"And what step does he take towards quelling them? He presents his own person, forsooth, at the Barracks, as if he, of all men in the land, after the acrimony which he had exhibited against the KING's troops in the whole progress of the Inquiry before the Coroner, were precisely the individual best calculated to assuage the irritation which his own conduct had excited! What is the consequence? His presence fans the flame," If Mr. WAITHMAN's person was known to the soldiery, they recognised in him one of the principal Civil Authorities of the County: and the outrages wilfully offered to the person of the High Sheriff, in the execution of his duty, demand the most exemplary punishment. If the person of Mr. WAITHMAN were not known, the argument of THE COURIER altogether fails.

We have to remark, that, in this extract, Mr. WAITHMAN is studiously represented as acting in an individual character, and mentioned under his private designation; but when the precedent is, we suppose, to be established, of a soldier resisting the authority of a high civil authority, he is styled the Sheriff, and it is contended to be justifiable for a soldier to threaten to shoot a Sheriff of the county, whom he apprehends to be about to ride up and seize either himself or his comrades.

We are disposed to consider the affair of Sunday as a pretty fair commentary on that of the 14th; the difference is simply such as might be expected from the complete impunity under which the soldier fancies himself to be sheltered—he perceiving that it is the disposition of Government to spread the shield of power before the sword of violence. In the one instance, the civil authority was altogether despised and neglected—in the other outraged and repelled. Sir R. BAKER is led about the streets at the pleasure and discretion of the Commander of an Escort, unheeded and unconsulted. The Sheriff of the County, in the other instance, is assaulted, and threatened with being instantly shot through the head, in attempting to quell a riot; but then he is stated to have made himself individually obnoxious, and neither respect nor obedience, it would seem, are to be paid to authority vested in a person who may, in the upright discharge of a duty, have become the object of partial dislike.—*Morning Chronicle, Aug. 29.*

Saturday, March 16, 1822.

—159—

Sheriff of Middlesex to Lord Bathurst.—The letter from the Sheriff of Middlesex to Lord Bathurst, which we now present to our readers, will command attention. It contains a narrative of the events of last Sunday, differing in no important particular from our own statement already before the public, and concludes with an appeal to the Secretary of State on the necessity of affording some reparation for the outrage offered by a licentious soldiery to the law of England, and to the persons of its officers. Sheriff WATMAN designates the conduct of the Life Guards "as a violent outrage on the public peace, and an attempt at assassination upon himself personally, while in the exercise of his duty as Sheriff of Middlesex, at the head of the civil power of the county." For the details of this Pretorian violence we refer those who are yet unacquainted with them to the concise and unadorned language of the Sheriff. If the King's Government overlook the facts therein described, or—(withhold they dare not, but)—betray any thing short of eagerness and alacrity in granting the most full redress for the wrongs endured, it is vain to say that there can exist henceforth in England, any legislator but the Commander-in-chief of the forces—any law but that of the sword. If the Sheriff of a county is to be put to death by one soldier, for no reason but because he has lent his aid to the investigation of a murder perpetrated by another soldier, then need no military man stand in awe of any court but a court-martial; nor can any magistrate venture to administer or enforce the laws. But there are symptoms throughout the whole proceeding, of a spirit more depraved than any which has hitherto shown itself amongst us. If insolence be committed by the common soldier, we resort to his officer as a medium of restraint or of reform: and it has been the boast of those who are advocates for standing armies, that in the English gentleman would be at all times found the proper corrective of the regimental spirit. How stands it now? When the Sheriff, in the true spirit of peace, and in respectful language, sent a message to request that the Commanding Officer in the barracks would withdraw his men from a fight with their fellow-subjects, what was the answer of this officer? "D—n your Sheriff, I will not keep my men prisoners for him!" Without implying a general attack on the military profession, we may say that such men are under no restraint of humanity or law; and are fit subjects to execute the orders of any modern CROMWELL who may meditate an attack upon the representatives of the people.—*Times*, Aug. 29.

Mr. Sheriff Wathman.—If we could bring ourselves to think that Ministers shared the opinion of THE COURIER, that the deliberate attempt to assassinate Mr. Sheriff WATMAN was not "very blameable," or that they were such strangers to every thing like propriety, as to approve of the heartless and revolting flippancy with which the Journal in question affects to treat matters of so serious a nature as those contained in the Sheriff's Letter to Lord BATHURST, we should consider the prospects of the country gloomy indeed. But blameable as was the conduct of Ministers on the fourteenth, and alarming as were the doctrines subsequently broached and acted on by them, we are still unwilling to charge them with this gratuitous offence against decency. We have not forgotten the declaration of the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in his place in Parliament, that there was often much in THE COURIER of which he was very far from approving. We observe also, that the Morning Paper which passed such severe strictures on THE COURIER, for the alarm originated by it before the Coronation (an alarm attended with such ruinous effects to many tradesmen), and which seems to have acquired no small share of the confidence of men in power, has carefully abstained from attempting to justify the outrage against the Sheriff. The high Tory principles of the writer of this last Journal we detect; but he has principles, which cannot be ascertained with equal truth of THE COURIER, and he knows what arguments are calculated to advance them; in which respect THE COURIER, who has yet to learn what reasoning is, might derive important benefit from him. He has seen in good time that the people of England are not yet prepared for approving of an open attempt of the military against the civil authority.—*Morning Chronicle*, Aug. 30.

Lord Bathurst to Mr. Wathman.—In another column, our Readers will find a letter from Lord BATHURST, in answer to the one from Mr. Sheriff WATMAN in our Paper of Tuesday.

Lord BATHURST here says, he had, before the receipt of Sheriff WATMAN's letter, given directions for an inquiry to be made into the circumstances of the riot at Knightsbridge, "in consequence of representations made to me, which, I am bound to say, differ in many essential particulars from the statement which I received from you." If the representations so made to his Lordship differ in many essential particulars from the statement of the Sheriff, we have every reason to believe that they are false. We have conversed with several most respectable eye-witnesses, who agree in all essential points with that statement. That the persons implicated in it should endeavour to give as favourable a representation of their conduct as possible is natural enough. But as his Lordship has ordered an inquiry, and the transactions were witnessed by such numbers of impartial persons, the truth will appear in spite of every attempt at misrepresentation.

His Lordship, misled by some of these misrepresentations, tells the SHERIFF, "I cannot refrain from expressing my regret and surprise, that, 'when the Civil Power under your direction was fully adequate (as you state) for the preservation of the peace among the people,' a mob should have been permitted to remain in a continued state of riot, after the Soldiers have been withdrawn within their Barracks, until the Riot Act was read by Mr. CONANT, and the rioters were dispersed by the peace officers under his immediate orders." Mr. Sheriff WATMAN, in answer to this, states positively that he was on the spot for nearly nine hours, and did not retire till he had assured himself, by riding about in different directions for about an hour and a half after the military, that tranquillity was perfectly restored, and that the reading of the Riot Act, and dispersion of rioters, must have arisen from some new and distinct disturbance. However, as an inquiry has been ordered, we shall not now enter farther into this affair. We trust the inquiry will be conducted in such a manner as to give satisfaction to the country. It would require very different circumstances, from any hitherto stated in the Ministerial Papers, to persuade the friends of the Constitution, that the conduct of the military towards the civil power was not highly to be condemned. We will not do the injustice to Ministers to anticipate their approbation of a deliberate attempt to assassinate the Sheriff, or even to set his authority at defiance. We are inclined to believe that on this, as well as many other occasions, they have been much misrepresented to the country by the Journals which pretend to serve them.

The attempt to render the people indifferent to an outrage like that which is now charged, by pretending the existence of a project for affecting "an entire revolution in the Government, Constitution, and property of the country," is too stale an artifice to have any success. It would require something more to induce a belief in the existence of such a conspiracy, than the circumstance of a Revolution being announced, without disguise, in the writings of CARLILE, a man possessed of neither talents, knowledge, nor influence, and who has only been brought into notoriety by the efforts of the Ministerial Journals, the Society for the Suppression of Vice, and the Bridge-street Association; or the insertion from THE SCOTSMAN in this Journal, of an able review of a recent publication on America. All who admire the Republican Government of America are not surely to be deemed desirous of changing the Monarchy of this country into a Republic. Even the writer of the book alluded to, a most ardent admirer of the institutions of America, doubts the possibility of introducing them with advantage into any country of Europe. We expect soon to hear every one who speaks a civil word in favour of ancient Greece or Rome, to be held out as plotters of a revolution.—*Morning Chronicle*, Aug. 31.

Difference between London and Dublin.—On the day of his MAJESTY's entry, a dragoon, pressing on the people at the Circular-road, near Boole's street, a nobleman of high distinction, from his carriage, reprimanded him severely, stating that "the KING would be very angry if he had seen the humblest of his people ill-used," and ordered him forthwith to desist.—*Dublin Post*.

Lord Bathurst's Reply.—If the Sheriff's letter to Lord BATHURST, reciting the shameful events of Sunday, was a document worthy of attention, so, we promise our readers, will be found the reply of the noble Secretary. That reply, with a rejoinder from the Sheriff, is contained in *THE TIMES* of this morning. The complaint of Alderman WAITHMAN, be it remembered, was, that certain military outrages had been committed upon himself and on the people, about six, or a quarter past six o'clock on Sunday evening, by the Life Guards in garrison at Knightsbridge barracks. The letter ended by calling for justice upon the guilty, and complete redress to the laws. This was the substance of Sheriff WAITHMAN's letter. Lord BATHURST begins by acknowledging the receipt of it. He next says, that "in consequence of representations made to him, which differed in many essential particulars from" Sheriff WAITHMAN's statement, "he," Lord BATHURST, "had ordered an inquiry to be made into the circumstances of this transaction." His Lordship then, to illustrate and explain the sort of representations which had been made to him, and the sort of "transaction" to which they referred, sets about lecturing Sheriff WAITHMAN for "having permitted a mob to remain in a continued state of riot after the soldiers had withdrawn within their barracks, until (mark ye?) the riot act was read by Mr. CONANT, and the rioters dispersed by the peace-officers under his immediate orders, in which duty Lord BATHURST does not understand that Mr. CONANT received any assistance from the Sheriff." Pause here awhile. It is about three days since we exposed the dirty trick of the jobbing papers, in attempting to confound the separate disturbances of last Sunday, and to apply to the earlier of them those statements which belonged only to the later. We are sorry to find that those who ought to have rebuked such wretched practices in their servants have not blushed to follow their example. Lord BATHURST gives no answer, no shadow of an answer, to any one branch of the Sheriff's complaint. He seems to forget the very subject of the Sheriff's communication, and, instead of promising satisfaction and redress for outrages perpetrated at about six o'clock, charges the Sheriff with misrepresentation and neglect of duty, on the ground of statements which had been made to him, Lord BATHURST, and which could by possibility have no reference but to transactions that took place three hours afterwards. Alderman WAITHMAN, in his rejoinder, says plainly.—"My Lord, you have blinked the question; you are not talking about that of which I was talking. You might as well, in your capacity of Colonial Minister, have made a mistake of Jamaica for Java, as one of your colleagues, a great negotiator, is known to have imagined that the kingdom of Wurtemberg and the town of Wittenberg were the same. But Lord BATHURST speaks of a continued riot from six o'clock until the riot act was read, and asks Mr. WAITHMAN how he came to have allowed it. Now Mr. WAITHMAN says in answer, that he was on the spot for nearly nine hours, and that he never left it until, as he believed, tranquillity was perfectly restored; yet because the Sheriff then went home, and an hour after his departure a "new and distinct riot" arose—nay, because two, or nearly two hours afterwards, the riot act was read within the barrack-yard by another Magistrate, neither the Sheriff, nor the community at large, is to have reparation for an attack upon his life, made when he was doing all that in man lay to quell another riot, without the aid of Mr. CONANT or of any other person in authority. We assert that such a subterfuge on the part of a Cabinet Minister is one of which he ought to be, and of which, by this time, we have reason to think he is, very truly and heartily ashamed. And what end can be promoted by such an unseemly effort to put down a civil functionary, whose office is at once the most ancient, the most respectable in the eyes of the people, the most vigorous and powerful in its support of the executive government, of any acknowledged by the laws of England? The Sheriff is the very right hand of the King's Ministers. Woe to that Statesman who casts away the staff of the peace-officer, and leans upon the sword instead. But to return to the text of his Lordship's letter, Mr. WAITHMAN is blamed because he was not present when Mr. CONANT read the riot act, which was done at a little before 10 at night. Now, is there any law which requires the Sheriff of Middlesex to stand sentry in front

of Knightsbridge barracks, when the service for which he has kept the post during more than half a day has been successfully and completely performed? Lord BATHURST does not seem to be aware, that so far as depended on his foresight, a far more dreadful scene might have occurred at Knightsbridge, without the interference, the presence, or the [knowledge of any civil officer whatever, Lord BATHURST had warned the Lord Mayor to be in readiness, but beyond the city his Lordship knew that such an intimation was nothing worth. His Lordship well knew the intended course of the procession—that it must pass through Knightsbridge on the way to Hammersmith. Why, then, did he not write to the Sheriff of Middlesex, as he had done to the Lord-Mayor of LONDON? Were no lives worth saving west of Temple-bar? The Sheriff, therefore, we contend, was not bound to be present—was not bound to know the existence of any danger—had not his own solicitude for the preservation of the peace been apparently more active than that of the Minister who upbraids him. Or did the noble Lord condescend to apprise his own stipendiary Magistrates of the necessity for their presence? If so, they would of course have shown themselves; if so, Mr. CONANT would have been assisting the High Sheriff from 11 or 12 o'clock to 8, when the real danger was to be apprehended—he would at least have been ready to save that public officer from being shot or cut down at six o'clock, instead of wondering what had become of him, long after he had executed his arduous and perilous duties. But since Lord BATHURST sees grounds for regret, so perhaps may others also. It may be regretted that the gates of the barracks were not closed from morn to night of the day fixed upon (wisely, we do not say) for this imbittering procession. It may be regretted, that since so easy a prevention was not applied to a risk so obvious, room has been afforded for more or less suspicion, that a sufficient desire is not shown by Ministers to prevent an occasional encounter between the soldiers and their fellow-subjects. It is indeed greatly to be regretted, that a better spirit has not been breathed into the officers of the King's Guards, one of whom openly insulted the civil representative of the King's person, for a proposal which was calculated to save the blood of his people. Most of all is it to be deplored by honest men, that the servants of the Crown, who ought to be the protectors of the King's subjects, should so often appear the apologists and partisans of every odious violence committed against the public freedom. The best laws that ever were framed must depend at last for their efficacy and stability upon the good-will of those who are to obey them. If a bad Minister, then, through arrogance or contempt of the public feeling, so acts as to inspire a nation with the belief that the powers legally intrusted to him are employed for the subversion, and not the preservation, of those rights, to maintain which is the end of all law and all salutary power, he undermines the throne itself by loosening from it the affections of the people, and is himself the great and only conspirator against that Monarch whom, at their expense, he wickedly as well as vainly seeks to aggrandize.—*Times*, Aug. 31.

Adulation.—There is a *bon mot* recorded in an answer made to a Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, which strongly exemplifies the conduct of the sister country, in its present adulation of his Majesty. Pray, said his Excellency, how happens it there are no toads in Ireland? "Because," answered an Hibernian, "there are a great number of us toad eaters."

Bell Christening.—The Princes and Princesses, in consideration of the happy birth of the Duke of BORDEAUX, have (says a French Paper) deigned to consent to be the godfathers and godmothers of the parish bells in the town of Nesle (Somme).

Madeira and Sherry.—A gentleman who is a lover of good wine, on looking into his wine cellar the other day, where there was a pipe of Sherry lying near to a pipe of Madeira, discovered, with great surprise, that on the head of the Sherry pipe there were a great many long small worms round the little wood peg where the cask had been bored to taste the wine, but not one worm near the peg of the Madeira pipe; and on inquiry of different wine merchants, he finds that it is constantly the case, that Sherry always breeds worms, but Madeira does not.

MISCELLANEOUS.

—161—

Affray at Knightsbridge.

In consequence of the circumstances which took place at Knightsbridge on Sunday afternoon, Mr. Sheriff Waithman has addressed the following letter to Lord Bathurst:—

MR. WAITHMAN TO LORD BATHURST.

MY LORD, *Bridge-street, August 27, 1821.*

I consider it my duty to apprise his Majesty's Government, through your Lordship, of a violent outrage of the public peace committed by some individuals of the Life Guards at Knightsbridge yesterday, and of an attempt at assassination upon me personally, while in the exercise of my duty as Sheriff of Middlesex, as the head of the civil power of the county.

Your Lordship thought proper to direct the Lord Mayor on Saturday to take the necessary measures to preserve the peace of the city during the intended funeral of Honey and Francis; and although no such caution was addressed to the sheriff, as conservator of the public peace of the county, I felt it my duty to direct the deputy sheriffs of the city and county to order out the constables of the divisions nearest to, and through which the funeral was expected to pass; and also to attend in person with proper officers, to prevent or quell any tumult or disorder.

Conceiving that, under the existing irritation of the people, and the circumstances for which they had assembled, some insult might be offered to the Life Guards in their barracks, I disposed of the constables chiefly in that vicinity, and actually ranged a body of them in front of the barracks, with instructions to apprehend every individual who should attempt to commit any act of outrage or disorder.

The funeral, in consequence of these precautions, passed the barracks in an orderly and quiet manner, marked by no other peculiar circumstance than that of a brick being thrown from the barracks, which fell near my horse, and wounded, as I am informed, a young girl. My admonitions, and the presence of the constables, succeeded, however, in repressing the irritation this wanton act was calculated to excite.

When the procession had passed, and while the road continued to be crowded with people, the gates of the barracks were thrown open, and the avenues filled with the soldiers: The people, as might have been foreseen, gathered round the spot, and expressed their displeasure. A tumult seemed inevitable. I requested to speak with the officer on duty, but without effect; and at length, by repeated expostulations with the soldiers, I succeeded in prevailing upon them to retire and close the gates.

Some time after, upon returning to the same spot, I saw a number of soldiers running from the wicket gate, and pursuing the people on the causeway. Finding an affray actually commenced, I sprang my horse upon the causeway, interposed between the parties, and succeeded in separating them. While thus engaged, a soldier, with whom I had before been expostulating, and who was therefore acquainted with my official station, started forward at a man and knocked him down. At the same time, while using my utmost endeavours to prevail upon the soldiers to retire into the barracks, and the people to desist and keep the peace, the bridle of my horse was violently seized, on the one side by a young officer in undress, and on the other by the soldier whose violence I had just noticed, who together endeavoured to throw my horse over the causeway; and I only succeeded in extricating myself by striking the soldier with my stick, and making my horse plunge. Immediately several of the soldiers rushed at me with their swords drawn, and one actually loaded his carbine, and directed it towards me, but was, as I have been informed, knocked down by one of the constables. Further mischief was prevented by the interposition of some military officers of higher authority, and the soldiers at length retired into their barracks.

My Lord, these circumstances require no comment. At a critical conjuncture the soldiers were left to their own exasperated feeling, and manifested a lawless spirit. The civil power under my direction was fully adequate for the preservation of the peace among the people, but not to encounter an armed soldiery. I had no communication from his Majesty's government, nor could I obtain an interview with any of the officers of the regiment; and when I directed some of the constables to represent to the officers in the most respectful terms, my desire that the soldiers should be kept within the barracks, the message returned was, "That the Sheriff might be d—d, they would not make their men prisoners for him;" and I feel assured, that had I not interposed with the civil power, and even risked my own life, a frightful slaughter must have ensued. Of subordination to civil authority the soldiery appeared to be wholly unconscious, and that authority, in my person, was repeatedly insulted and grossly outraged.

It would, my Lord, be as needless as presumptuous in me, to attempt to instruct your Lordship and his Majesty's Government in the nature of the constitutional authority under which I attended yesterday, or the right I possessed in my official character to have claimed the aid and assistance of those very military to suppress tumult, who have, upon this occasion, in open defiance of the civil authority, been the promoters of it; nor need I add one word in aggravation of the enormity of the offences committed: the offenders can, some of them, be identified, and I trust your Lordship will cause immediate and effectual means to be adopted to bring them to justice, as a salutary example to others. I have the honour to be, my Lord,

Your Lordship's obedient humble servant,

The Rt. Hon. Earl Bathurst, &c. &c.

R. WAITHMAN.

LORD BATHURST TO MR. WAITHMAN.

SIR,

Whitehall, Aug. 28, 1821.

I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 27th instant, relative to a riot which took place at Knightsbridge on Sunday last.

I had, before the receipt of your letter, given directions for an inquiry to be made into the circumstances of this transaction, in consequence of representations made to me, which I am bound to say differ in many essential particulars from the statement which I have received from you.

I cannot refrain from expressing my regret and surprise, that "when the civil power under your direction was fully adequate (as you state) for the preservation of the peace among the people," a mob should have been permitted to remain in a continued state of riot, after the soldiers had been withdrawn within their barracks, until the riot act was read by Mr. Conant, and the rioters dispersed by the peace-officers under his immediate orders; and I do not understand that in the execution of this duty he received any assistance from you.

I am, Sir, your most obedient humble servant,

Mr. Sheriff Waithman.

BATHURST.

MR. WAITHMAN TO LORD BATHURST.

MY LORD,

Bridge-street, Aug. 29, 1821.

As my object in the representation I had the honour to make to his Majesty's Government through your Lordship of the circumstances of the affray which occurred within my own observation at Knightsbridge on Sunday, was the performance of what appeared to me to be an indispensable duty, your Lordship's note acknowledging the receipt of the communication would seem to require no reply, more especially as your Lordship intimates that you have given directions for an inquiry into the circumstances of this transaction; and, although bound to acknowledge your Lordship's candour in communicating the receipt of representations which differ in many essential particulars from my statement, I should have relied in confidence upon the result of that inquiry establishing the facts I had the honour to represent to your Lordship.

It appears, however, highly important to that inquiry that I should explain to your Lordship, that although I was on the spot for nearly nine hours, and did not retire till I had assured myself, by riding about in different directions for above an hour and a half after the affray with the military, that tranquillity was perfectly restored, no riot act was read within my hearing or knowledge at or near Knightsbridge barracks on Sunday last; if, therefore, the riot act was read by Mr. Conant, and the rioters dispersed by the peace-officers under his orders, your Lordship will perceive that this must have arisen from some new and distinct disturbance, and was not the consequence of the mob "being permitted to remain in a continued state of riot after the soldiers had been withdrawn within their barracks." During the whole period I was in the vicinity I neither saw nor heard of the attendance of any magistrate; and your Lordship cannot but feel equal surprise with myself that the High Sheriff of the county, at the head of the civil power, should have received neither assistance nor communication from Mr. Conant or any other magistrate.

The representation I had the honour to forward to your Lordship, stated a gross violation of the public peace and daring outrage upon the civil power by the Life Guards at Knightsbridge, the circumstances of which I need not repeat; and your Lordship's reply appears to have reference only to some unforeseen occurrences two hours afterwards, and consequently could not have provoked the previous assault by the soldiery, and which therefore neither concerns me nor the subject of the complaint, which still remains the same, and demands rigorous inquiry and exemplary satisfaction. I have the honour to be, my Lord,

Your Lordship's obedient humble servant,

The Right Hon. Earl Bathurst, &c.

R. WAITHMAN.

Affray at Knightsbridge Barracks.

(We insert the following letter from one of the persons apprehended on Sunday night at Knightsbridge Barracks, because its statement is supported by the evidence of consistency and the appearance of honesty. The best confirmation indeed of its truth is to be found in the immediate discharge of its author, without requiring bail or inflicting punishment. Whatever inscrutable reasons there might be for detaining him, after the explanation which he gave of his conduct, we cannot even conceive a motive for the cruel treatment to which he was subjected.)

SIR, *To the Editor of the Times.*

Having read different statements relating to the affray at Knightsbridge on Sunday last, opposite the barracks, and finding them both unjust and incorrect as regards myself, I request you to give insertion to the following narrative:—On Sunday evening last, at a quarter before 8 o'clock, I left the Kensington-road to return home. When I came opposite the barracks, an immense number of officers rushed from the barracks towards town. Not having a wish to intermix with people or constables, I returned two or three paces, and got on a step by a door opposite the barracks. Instantly almost an officer came and collared me, and said, "Go home; go home." I said I was at home. Not pointing distinctly at the door, he instantly beat the door with a stick or staff, and was answered by some person in the window above. What the answer was I don't know. He insisted I should be taken into the barracks, and pulled me from the door. I told him I done no one an injury, and was within one minute's walk of home, and wished him to go with me. Other officers then returned, and seeing him taking me across the road, they immediately rushed on, some brandishing their staffs, and others saying, "Don't strike him, don't strike him." I was taken instantly into the guard-room. Residing so near the barracks, I was known by several of the Guards. I asked one of them to make use of my name to one of the officers of the regiment, whom I knew, and begged him to state the situation I was in. On his return, he said the officer was mounted, and could not immediately attend; but would, after he dismounted, and do me any service he could, at least as far as lay in his power. I was then taken to a room where a magistrate was sitting; and this officer, named Plank, gave charge of me in consequence of my having refused to move after been told so to do ten times. Although he swore it to be the truth, I declare it was wrong. He also stated that I said I was at home when I was not. This was the charge. I stated my reasons for being at the door, which were for the purpose of securing myself from blows from officers. I also stated to the magistrate the situation I was in, particularly in having the key of the house, which I laid before him. Not being allowed to send for bail, it was agreed, if either of the corporals of the regiment would be answerable for my appearance at Marlborough-street in the morning, I might be set at liberty for the night. I called a corporal; he was looked for, but although it was said the regiment was all in barracks, yet this man was not to be found. I then called a private, this man came, but refused being answerable for any one, though having occasionally employed his wife in making up linen, and being well known to himself, I had no doubt but he would have granted me the favour. The magistrate shortly after left the room, and the officers produced some handcuffs. To be handcuffed, and detained all night and a greater part of the following day, for standing by a door way to prevent myself from being interrupted, or getting in with a mob of people and a mob of constables—this, to me, was shocking. I told them I was willing, if it was their determination to detain me, to go to any place quietly without being handcuffed. I was answered by the officer, as I did not seem to like the handcuffs I should be handcuffed first. There were three others in custody, and we were taken privately in the night across the park. After going to different gates, which were blocked up, we at last found an entrance into Park-lane, and from thence to Mount-street watchhouse. Although I had procured some one to give directions, so that the proprietors of the shop, which I have the charge of might be made acquainted of the circumstance; yet those officers would not allow me to speak to him or send the key by him, but immediately closed the door against him. I had no other step to take then, but to ask one of those officers to take the key, and inform the proprietors what had occurred. This he refused. I was then conducted down stairs, and locked up in a disgusting place. The officers then consented to deliver the key to the proprietors, residing in Tottenham-court; it was then 11 o'clock, and after being confined in that place 12 hours, I was ordered up stairs; the officers were waiting, and the handcuffs were also in readiness to put on again. I asked him, and begged him to allow me a coach if it was his intention to put them on. He said I might have a coach on condition I would pay for it: so had I been so unfortunate as to have been without silver, I must have walked from Mount-street to Marlborough-street handcuffed, passing the houses of some of my acquaintances. I was then taken to Marlborough-street, and put in a sort of a cell, (pretty well ironed) and rather dark; my friends at this time had heard I was confined, and se-

veral I was allowed to see. I was from that place taken before the magistrate, the same one I had been before on Sunday evening. The officer (seeing me I suppose surrounded with friends) said he did not wish to persevere or press the charge, but stated nearly the same as on the evening before. The magistrate after making a few remarks as to the riot act having been read, and relating to the conduct of the Guards, thought proper to discharge me.

I wish you to insert the above in your paper. I subscribe my name in attestation of its truth.

157, Sloane street.

G. THRESHER, Tallow-chandler.

Onus Probandi.

SIR, *To the Editor of the Times.*

At this moment it might be improper to offer observations upon, or to apply the reasoning of the passage I intend to quote from the address of Mr. Justice Bayley to the Grand Jury of Northumberland in reference to a prisoner to be tried for shooting at an officer of the revenue; but as what proceeds from so high an authority in the exposition of the of the law can not be too generally known, I therefore call public attention to the passage. It is extracted from *THE TIMES* of yesterday, Aug. 28, 1821. The learned Judge says, "If several persons were engaged, each party is answerable in law. The *onus probandi* that the party were engaged in a lawful business rested upon the party accused. If they (the Grand Jury) felt a doubt upon this part of the case, they ought to find the bill and thus put the question into investigation; for then, if any difficulty arose, it could be regularly submitted to the consideration of the 12 Judges."—I am, Sir, yours,

THOMAS JAMES, August 29.

W. D.

Breach of Promise of Marriage.

YORK ASSIZES, AUG. 16, 1821.—BEFORE MR. JUSTICE BAYLEY.

DAVIDSON V. WILSON.

Mr. COLTMAN opened the pleadings. The plaintiff, James Davidson, asked compensation in damages for breach of promise of marriage by Rachel Wilson, the defendant. The defendant denied that any promise had been given, and upon that issue was joined.

Mr. SCARLETT.—He had to state to them the case opened by his Learned Friend. The plaintiff now applied to them for some reparation in damages for the loss he had sustained in being deprived of a marriage which had been contracted, and from which he had reason to expect comfort and happiness. A celebrated writer, who would be admired as long as the English language lived, and whose observations on life, manners, and human nature formed the surest authority to which their attention could be directed—he meant Lord Bacon; this celebrated writer had said, that "a young man marries for a mistress; a middle aged man for a companion; an old man for a nurse." This remark was authorised by the highest species of philosophy, and by the justest views of human nature. "It is not good for man to be alone. Solitude at any period of life was not good; we were made for society, and for communicating and enjoying pleasure or consolation by reciprocity of attention and kindness." He made these remarks, because he observed a smile upon some faces on account of the age of his client. He admitted that he was 63; and if at that age he could not provide himself with a nurse on account of the defendant's conduct, he was entitled to damages, and must feel as sensibly as a younger man the loss he suffered. The defendant was sufficiently advanced in life to be answerable for her promises; she had attained to all the discretion which years ensured; she was not a giddy, thoughtless extravagant girl; she was not of an age that would make her marriage with the plaintiff unhappy, as in many cases which occurred. She was a very steady, a very discreet, a very sensible lady, and of an age quite suitable for the plaintiff. Miss Wilson, he understood, was 64 years of age (the bursts of laughter infected the Learned Counsel himself, and occasioned a short pause in the love-story). They saw how difficult it was to excite sympathy for love at this age. He wished he possessed the genius and the eloquence of a celebrated writer, a foreigner, who charmed all his readers by the description of love at the age of 60, or that he felt the genius and poetic fire of a great writer of our own age and country, Lord Byron, who had made the love of an old man of 80 the subject of a tragedy. The love which he had to state to the Jury was one of the soberest views which the passion presented. But there was great advantage, after all, in aged love—in having the comforts and advantages of a steady and matured union of sentiments. A true friend was not to be found in any other state, if it was true that there was no real friendship but in perfect community of interest. The plaintiff had been originally a sea-faring man, and by his distinguished gallantry on board of a vessel which he commanded, he had raised himself to notice. He had been married, and had had a family, of whom

Saturday, March 16, 1822.

—163—

some were now living. His wife had died in 1805. Since that time he lived in Ayton, where the defendant lived with her father, mother, and younger sister. The plaintiff's and defendant's families meeting, in the same line of life, they became acquainted. From long acquaintance, Mr. Davison and Miss Wilson learned to esteem each other. When he became a widower his visits were more frequent. She had then a brother, who was his particular friend, but was now dead. They thus became extremely well acquainted with each other, and cherished the greatest mutual respect. At length, her father, her mother, and her younger sister died, leaving her alone of the family. He (Mr. Scarlett) was able to show, that before this period great intimacy and constant intercourse had subsisted, though there had been then no views of a matrimonial connection, but of friendship only. But at that time the mutual attachment which had been so long increasing had taken a different turn. She was left desolate, not in fortune, for she had 10,000l.; but she was alone in life, having lost her father, mother, brother, and sister. This gentleman continued to be one of her most intimate friends: in him she reposed confidence; him she consulted in the administration of her affairs. In this state she would not find it inconvenient to have the affection and attachment of one who understood the world, and who could be of great use in managing her affairs. She, living alone in the house which her family had occupied, had resolved, from the extreme inconveniences of the house, which was old, and too large, to sell it; she quitted it and took lodgings of a Mr. Williams, in Gisbrough, leaving the plaintiff to arrange the various matters which she had to settle in Ayton. At this period he should begin to lay before them evidence of that contract, the breach of which was the ground of the present action, although he felt averse to expose the enlightened communications which were made upon this subject. She had actually made the plaintiff engage a house in order to live together in it as man and wife. How it was, then, that the union had not taken place would be shewn to them. He (Mr. Scarlett) did not mean to say that his client had been so absurd as to despise the additional comforts to be derived from a wife's fortune; but her fortune had not been his object. He had said, "with respect to fortune I ask not a farthing; settle it as you please, except what may be necessary for our living comfortably." But as matters approached a crisis, and after she had left the house at Ayton, he wrote her a letter, which the other party were now challenged to produce, saying, "that she ought to communicate to Mr. and Mrs. Dodds her intention of changing her condition." That was the cause of the present action, for they, one or both, had dissuaded her from fulfilling her engagement. He would now lay before them the correspondence. They would not find in it the strong expressions of passion which a girl of 18 might be expected to use; but the sober discretion and the prudence which were required in a wife predominated. (The Learned Counsel here read extracts of several letters, in which the maiden lady made arrangements respecting her nephew, William Wilson, an orphan, and the mortgage of an estate, and from which the Learned Counsel inferred unbounded confidence in her plighted lover.) Her letter of Oct. 7, 1820, she directed him to burn. Why that caution? What she wrote must have meaning in it, when so much caution was applied to it. In her letter of October 18, the first intimation of her intention to change her condition appeared. She avowed some views which she was unwilling to commit to paper. Those views were communicated at a personal interview. They could not be proved as thus communicated, but they could be inferred from other letters. In her letter of the 2d of December, she wrote—"Time brings all things about." Just what a lady always said when the fixing of the day was proposed. Ask that it should be to-morrow? Impossible; but time brings all things about. "If it should be told to Mr. —, it will make me quite unhappy." This must have been some jester, who would make her uncomfortable by his jests on the subject. "None of my relations would disapprove of it." Let them observe that.—Disapprove of what? The directions for taking a house, the apprehensions of ridicule, the reference to time bringing about all things, that was clearly the wedding day: then the allusions, to the month of May proved distinctly what step the lady meant to take. She directed that two cows would be sufficient. This was prudent attention. She further regretted that she had not been able to go to Ayton on a certain day to drink tea, but she would go on a certain day for the electrifying machine. (here the Learned Counsel was interrupted with laughter.) He would explain what this meant. Her young nephew was supposed to require electric shocks, and she would go to Ayton for the electrifying machine, and thus see Captain Davison, whom she had disappointed, by not having kept her engagement in going to tea. This was a good excuse for going to Ayton. She had been invited by some friends to the York Assizes. The Spring Assizes at York were pleasant. He understood that there were festivities on those occasions, of which persons partook who did not work so hard as "you and I." May time, too, was approaching. That was the happy month, which time, that brought all things about, was to bring. That was the month which the poet celebrated as the month of marriage:—

"Now from the virgin's cheek a fresher bloom
Shoots, less and less, the live carnation round.

Her lips blush deeper sweets—
The shining moisture swells into her eye.
—her wishing bosom heaves.
With palpitations wild: kind tumults seize
Her veins, and all her yielding soul is love."

(Repeated bursts of laughter). "Whenever you marry again, Gentlemen, May is the proper time." She intimates to her accepted lover, that she was to be gay next week at York, where she was to attend concerts, and other amusements, suited to her prospects, and she directs him to take the intended house only for six years. This was extremely prudent and proper, for the house might not be large enough in course of six years. She approved of his advice to communicate her intention to Mr. and Mrs. Dodds, because they were good religious persons, and very friendly to her and family. She next corresponded respecting her residence after her return from York, till the merry month of May, and in one of her letters she wrote, "I am very much watched here." She felt inconvenience in writing her letters and getting them into the Post-office. It had been all probably kind attention only, but she thought, as ladies in such circumstances were apt to think, that all eyes were upon her (a laugh).—In this correspondence it appeared evident that she was to change her situation, that she knew the plaintiff's attachment, and approved of it; and that her wedding day was put off till May, for that was the time to bring all things about. But upon consulting Mr. and Mrs. Dodds, a change of mind took place, and she wrote a cold and doubtful letter. He asked an explanation. She answered with the same coldness and reserve. This was no doubt the advice of respectable persons. He did not blame Mr. and Mrs. Dodds. Every one has his own views of happiness.

Mr. Justice BAYLEY—A very kind advice it was to prevent them from doing a very foolish thing.

Mr. SCARLETT—Another letter was written, intimating that the house would not be required, and this letter was subscribed "your obedient servant, Rachel Wilson." (The former subscriptions had been "yours, sincerely, &c.") The Jury would see from those circumstances the ground of complaint. She was most competent to judge for herself. There was a great deal of good feeling and good sense in the letters which he had referred to. If, then, the contract was such as she had thought proper to make, and then to break, ought not some compensation to be made to the plaintiff? There were many reasons which might induce a man to look to marriage for happiness. To look up to a matrimonial situation was surely a meritorious thing in any man. For the last fifteen years the plaintiff had been intimate with the defendant, and he was now thrown back on all the miseries of solitude. He was deprived of the prospect which her promise had encouraged him to look to, and he lost a companion to support his old age.

He would prove the promise from the letters of which he had read extracts.

Mr. Justice BAYLEY—And the breach, too, I suppose? His Lordship then held a short conversation with Mr. Scarlett, we suppose in recommending an arrangement of a cause which His Lordship evidently thought was ill fitted for a court of justice.—The attempt, however, appeared in the first instance to fail.

Mr. George Dodds looked at a volume of letters put into his hands, and said he believed they were Miss Wilson's handwriting. I think I have not seen any of Mr. Davison's letters to the defendant. I do know from Miss Wilson that she received some. I think she did not show me any. At my age I cannot remember things as I ought. I think I did not hear any of them read. I don't know from Miss Wilson that she intended to marry. She did mention her intention of changing her situation—in respect to the house taken at Ayton. That was the only change of situation she communicated to me. I swear it. She did not communicate any other change of situation to Mrs. Dodds in my hearing.

An arrangement was again attempted.

Mr. SCARLETT—Gentlemen of the Jury, I accede to a proposition from my Lord to take a verdict for a very small sum, and proceed no further in this cause. I beg to say that I did not mean to cast any reflection on the lady. Persons have a right to judge what is most suitable for themselves at every period of life; and though solemn promises are not to be broken with impunity, yet considering the ages of the parties, and their situation in life, I could not expect such damages from you as if they were younger, and there were more love and sentiment in their attachment.

Mr. RAINE—I am very glad, gentlemen, that this cause is put an end to.

Mr. Justice BAYLEY—Twenty pounds is all, in the circumstances of the case, which I have thought the plaintiff entitled to.

The FOREMAN—That is as much as we should be disposed to give.

Mr. Justice BAYLEY—I am happy that we have the same understanding on the subject.

Verdict for the plaintiff—Damages £20.

The Court was extremely crowded, especially with ladies, and we never saw more merriment excited by the afflictions of disappointed love.

Sir Robert Wilson.

Sir, To the Editor of the Morning Chronicle.

A paragraph in THE JOHN BULL of yesterday has been brought under my notice, in which it is falsely and malignantly asserted, "that my family enjoy a pension from the Crown." I disdain to hold any communication with this slanderer, but I shall feel obliged by your stating, on my authority, the fact, that his Majesty was graciously pleased, at the time I was suffering confinement in France, to grant, in the kindest manner, an allowance to two of my children, which, on my return and election for the Borough of Southwark, I deemed it my duty, as a Member of Parliament, respectfully to request might be withdrawn, and which allowance ceased accordingly.—Your obedient servant,

18, Regent-street, Aug. 26, 1821.

R. WILSON.

Financial Skill of Ministers

SIBI PARCERE PERITI.

Sir, To the Editor of the Morning Chronicle.

The columns of THE MORNING CHRONICLE have frequently been occupied with expositions of the folly and imbecility of Ministers; and, as a consequence inseparably attendant upon so ungrateful a task, it has sometimes been accused (with what justice, I leave, Mr. Editor, to your own conscience to decide) of partiality—of depreciating, if not entirely concealing, those masterly strokes of address and policy, which, in the opinion of their most zealous adherents, have occasionally marked the course of their administration. An opportunity of refuting so unworthy a charge may not be unthankfully received; and it is with a view of promoting the interests of your Journal, that I invite you to publish, in the spirit of candour and good faith, a recent instance of ministerial talent and wisdom, which I think cannot fail, in spite of your avowed political bias, to excite your admiration.

I do not here allude to the *fact* and statesmanlike address with which, at the close of the last session, Mr. Home's sweeping motion for retrenchment was counteracted by one, ostensibly of equal force, got up under the immediate eye of the Government. I might justly fear to presume too much upon your forbearance, were I to indulge in enthusiastic praises of this splendid and energetic measure. My present business is merely with the *manner* in which this great work of reform has been carried into effect. The complete and immediate abolition of all useless offices, the impartial revision of those which must necessarily be continued in existence, the suppression of the gross abuse of allowing to one individual the emoluments of a plurality of situations, and the reduction of the salaries of all public servants (without any distinction) to such rates as might, in fairness and justice, be assigned upon a due appreciation of their respective duties—were among the numerous salutary changes which were confidently expected to take place. It was rumoured that the patriotic labour of retrenchment would at length be undertaken and effected without the impediments usually interposed by selfishness, and a glaring and scandalous partiality. The great officers of State were to set the example of renouncing at once a third, or at least a fourth, of their salaries; and it was understood that they had agreed to console themselves for this comparatively trifling sacrifice by the enjoyment of their other larger possessions—in most cases derived from the liberality of the public—and the exercise of that power and patronage which are known to be far above all pecuniary price. Having thus given up something themselves, it was supposed that they would have been more competent to inquire into the receipts of others, and to enforce the general measure of taxing every individual, however high his station, who derived a considerable income from the public purse.

This would have been all very patriotic and loyal; but it would have been, after all, but a simple, downright transaction, and, it must be confessed, could afford but little opportunity for the display of those more refined qualities which are usually admired in great statesmen. If, however, persons so peculiarly situated as the present Ministers—embarrassed and almost overwhelmed as they are with financial difficulties of their own special creation—had proposed to themselves such a problem as the following, viz.

To discover a method of satisfying the general cry for retrenchment, and, in the prosecution of this laudable object, to seize upon a portion of the incomes (in many instances hardly and deservedly earned) of the minor dependants of Government who dare not complain, while, under a decent pretext, we exempt ourselves and our more considerable adherents from any share in the general contribution.—I think, Mr. Editor, that the solution of such a problem might claim the admiration of an Euclid, and I should hope also, of that of THE MORNING CHRONICLE.

Indeed nothing could be more difficult than to discover the decent pretext here alluded to, and in which lay the *modus* of the proposition. The value of money is said to be increased, since the Peace, and that some part of the emoluments of the public servants may therefore be fairly withdrawn, in order to reduce their receipts to the same standard of value as they bore during the War. But this reasoning applies

with the same force to the Sovereign, the other members of the Royal Family and the Ministers, as to the meanest retainer of the public.

It was, then, discovered, rather fortunately, that precisely that description of persons, whom it was desirable to exempt from the operation of the proposed tax, was not comprehended among those entitled to superannuated allowances under the 50th Geo. 3, cap. 117; and although it is notorious that they were excepted because they are better provided for from other sources, this circumstance was made the ground-work of a most notable and ingenious piece of imposition. The boasted reduction was modified into a projected contribution for and to provide for those allowances, and was therefore very naturally limited to the obnoxious class. By this able contrivance, a part of the public servants are to contribute towards the relief of the country an annual rate of 5 per cent. calculated upon the amount of their respective salaries: but as this might be considered, under all the circumstances, as only a light burthen, it is singly to be laid only on the shoulders of the most favoured of the taxed individuals. A most partial and injurious private scrutiny has been undertaken into the duties and services of the officers, and the offices themselves are rated at a capricious valuation, to the amount of which it is decreed, that the successors of the actual possessors shall be restricted, while the latter are to pay (in addition to the aforesaid 5 per cent.) a further duty, varying from 2½ to 6 and 10 per cent. upon their respective incomes.

It would require, perhaps, some reflection and knowledge of official details to enable an indifferent person fully to judge of the gross partiality and oppressive tendency of this measure. But although the public has some concern in the manner in which one class of its servants is treated by another class, it is infinitely more interested in the manner in which it is treated itself. Upon this point we are all at liberty to draw our own conclusions. I set out with calling upon you to admire a remarkable instance of the talent and prudence of the Cabinet, and I still think that we should not withhold the due meed of praise for their ingenuity. You will nevertheless be probably more disposed to join with me in lamenting such a palpably selfish application of their powers; and that the only display of unquestionable ability with which they have thought proper to favour us, should have been in the execution of an invidious design of screening themselves, in these times of general distress, from participating in a fair and equitable contribution towards the supply of the national exigencies.

August 20, 1821.

PUBLICUS.

On the Reduction of Salaries.

MY LORD, To the Right Honourable the Earl of Liverpool.

It is with deep regret that I obtrude myself on your Lordship's notice, but as the subject upon which I shall venture to offer a few remarks is of essential importance to a numerous and meritorious class of men, I shall not suppose for a moment that you will consider it beneath your attention.

It is rumoured that his Majesty's Government have it in contemplation to reduce the emoluments of all civil departments as nearly as possible to the level of those which existed in the year 1797. In proposing this period as the basis of their proceedings, I feel assured that they have been misled by false information, for a palpable act of injustice could never receive their sanction, nor could a measure so injurious to the interests of hundreds have met with their approbation, if its fate had depended on its own merits.

In the year 1797, it is a matter of notoriety that most, if not all civil situations, were greatly underpaid, and it is scarcely necessary to adduce any other argument in support of this assertion, than the simple fact, that in many offices the salaries had not been increased for twenty or thirty years previously to that period. This circumstance, I am convinced, must have escaped your Lordship's observation; for you could never wish to be understood that you consider money as valuable now as it was fifty or sixty years ago. But admitting for a moment that this was the case, let us consider the subject in another point of view. A young man, after an expensive education, accepts a situation in a public office (to which only a small salary is annexed), on the implied condition that his own good conduct will, after a certain number of years, insure him a comfortable maintenance. He marries on these expectations; it is with difficulty that he supports himself and family on his limited income. At this critical moment an order comes down from the Treasury, directing that a large per centage (in addition to the Land-Tax) be deducted from his miserable pittance; and ruining his future prospects, by reducing the superior situations in his department (after the death of their present possessors) to so low a scale that all his future hopes of comfort are annihilated, and not a ray of consolation displays itself to enliven the dark and dreary perspective. This, my Lord, is not a case which exists in the imagination alone;—on inquiry you will find that the sketch is but feebly drawn. To comment upon it would be to insult your feelings of justice—to offer any further observation would be useless. I leave it with confidence in your Lordship's hands, and have the honour to remain, with great respect, my Lord, Your Lordship's most obedient humble servant,

August 23, 1821.

AMICUS JUSTITIÆ.

ASIATIC DEPARTMENT.

—165—

Indian News.

Banks of the Canoon near Nagpoor, Feb. 18, 1822.—The inspection of the Troops comprising the Nagpoor Force began on Friday morning, the 15th instant, when Colonel Adams C. B. reviewed the Native Detachment of Horse Artillery under Lieut. Kempt, of the steadiness, activity, and efficiency of which, the Brigadier expressed his approbation.

On Saturday morning, that fine Corps the 8th Cavalry, under Lieut. Colonel O'Brien, were drawn up at an early hour, when the Brigadier (with numerous suite) proceeded to make its inspection. The morning was a peculiarly favorable one, the concourse of spectators immense, both European and Native; for among the former were to be seen almost every Officer of that part of the Force which is encamped upon the Canoon; and every person present seemed to enjoy a spectacle in which were exhibited a series of beautifully executed Cavalry manœuvres, combining steadiness, rapidity, and grace in an unusual degree of perfection. There are perhaps few sights more imposing than a Cavalry review: the martial appearance of the Troopers; the pawing and neighing of the impatient and proud steeds; the glittering of the ever-moving sabres; the dead silence of the spectators, broken in upon only by the occasional faint note of the trumpet, and the heavy firm tread of the advancing or retiring squadrons at the signal of their leaders, all join their efforts to work upon the imagination, and raise in the soldier's breast a feeling of enthusiasm which hurries back the mind to a vivid recollection of the recital in our history of the glorious deeds of the "mighty dead;" and when to this is joined the knowledge that these very warriors have performed, and may again perform similar brilliant passages, his feeling of triumphant pride cannot fail to be great.

All this "pride, pomp, and circumstance of glorious war" seems to belong peculiarly to the gallant fellows of the 8th; the regularity and activity of their motions was eminently conspicuous, and is, no doubt, to be attributed to an excellent interior system, and great attention of the Officers of the Corps, to whom it afforded all those present great pleasure to hear their distinguished and prompt Chief address the language of truth and compliment combined, in the short sentence which follows, upon being told by Col. Adams that he was much pleased with the steadiness of the Corps "for which, Gentlemen, I have to thank you."

These words were spoken at the conclusion of the Review, before which the Corps charged twice, first by Squadrons, and then in Line. After the charge of the left Squadron, we could see little for the clouds of dust which completely enveloped them, but of the charge in line, we had a most excellent view, and never was an advance better or more rapidly performed.

After the performances of this morning were over, the gallant and hospitable Colonel of the 8th Cavalry led the way to his spacious Tents, where a long range of Tables groaned under a tastefully arranged selection of every species of luxury and delicacy, which art, nature, and unbounded liberality could provide; and which was done ample "reason to" by the numerous happy and hungry guests, and the Officers of the 8th Cavalry, most of whom enjoyed the hospitality of their Entertainer again at tiffin, when a plenteous board again made its smiling appearance.

It is much to be lamented that the greater part of the Nagpoor Force, and particularly the 8th Cavalry, are at so great distance from Nagpoor; but no doubt the reasons which called for their being encamped upon a burning desert of sand and hot *kun-kur* where the Thermometer early in February stands in the shade at 99°, must be of an imperious nature, and consequently the utmost cheerfulness and resignation prevails upon the Canoon, the heroes of whose banks, doubtless console themselves with the reflection that he who "seeks the bubble reputation even in the cannon's mouth," has no more right to fear death from the "coup de soleil," than from the "coup de sabre." Such of our society, however, as want their military orders, will regret our disunion from the head-quarters, more particularly the lovers of the Drama, when they recollect how incompatible are the performance of the historic duties of some of our Amateurs, with their regimental duties on the Canoon.

Police of Oude.

To the Editor of the Calcutta Journal.

Sir,

My having had frequent occasion to pass through the Oude territory, and with apprehensions of being plundered, on account of the number of robberies which have lately been committed there, induces me to transmit you the following, which although it may have occurred to Government, still I trust it may be worthy of their further consideration. The weakness of the Oude Government is well known, and a further proof of it is, the inefficient state of the Police in allowing such repeated acts of atrocity, such as entering Military Cantonments in the night and plundering the Bazzars &c. From the nature of the present Government, it is unlikely it will improve. What a contrast to the state of the Police in the Company's Provinces! This induces me to suppose that a similar mode adopted in the Oude territory, would effectually eradicate the present system of crime carried on there to such a large extent. The gangs of Decoits find the Oude territory a place of shelter when they are afraid of being detected in our territory; and I suppose those whom Mr. Smith, the Acting Judge and Magistrate of Gyah, apprehended sometime ago, were returning to their old haunt, but unfortunately for them, meeting with an active Magistrate, their schemes were frustrated. Should such a person as the Magistrate abovementioned, who is acquainted with the different Gangs of Decoits who infest the King of Oude's Dominions, be nominated as Superintendent of Police, it would add much to the safety of the lives and property of people travelling through that part of the Country.

I am, Sir, your's &c.

Caenpoore, Feb. 15, 1822.

A DAWK TRAVELLER.

Letter from Nagpoor.

To the Editor of the Calcutta Journal.

Sir,

Editorial Controversy, and Communications tending to induce it, I am aware can neither be interesting to your readers nor be desired by you; but as the pages of the CALCUTTA JOURNAL have ever been open for the vindication of characters unjustly aspersed, to remove injuries unjustly imposed, I hope you will permit me to expose another specimen of the creed and the principles of JOHN BULL IN THE EAST. We have been informed in Central India, that this Mirror of Learning has obtained a new Editor, in consequence of the decease of the former in the Literary circles;

"Requiescat in pace"

It is fortunate however that this mighty downfall has not occasioned serious injury, only one Copy of that great and learned production being taken in here; but as that is sufficient as a vehicle of slanderous communication, I hope the Editor will not be offended at my adding to its eminence by the mention of its principles.

In my letter to you on the 10th of last month, I believe I satisfactorily proved that the whole of the letter stated to be written from Husingabad, on the subject of the rising of the Goonds &c. was entirely without foundation; and as very high authority had written to the Editor himself, stating that his Correspondent had communicated to him matter wholly unfounded, in consequence of which the Editor expressed his regret at being deceived, and avowed that his columns should never be made subservient to the purpose of offending &c. it was believed generally that the Correspondent who had led him astray in one instance, would not be permitted to do so again. We have, however, been disappointed; he readily published another letter on the 12th of last month in continuation of the former, conveying matter equally illiberal and equally untrue. But still Sir, all this might have been an oversight, had not a Note of the Editor's informed us that he had his doubts regarding the veracity and the intentions of the author; and as doubts existed, he rather chose to publish his Correspondent's letter. The authority

he had from this quarter informing him of the falsity of the first Communication, ought to have produced in him a different line of conduct; and it is therefore not unfair nor unjust to believe, that the Editor is equally to blame as the Correspondent for publishing matter replete with slanderous information. He may vindicate his own conduct by saying the Letter was merely a Squib; but it is a feeble one indeed. And his Correspondent may suppose that he had been writing a witty joke, when he mentions, that the Gurrawarrah road is infested with Tigers, with large heads and long tails; but as some men judge of animals by themselves, it may perhaps be his lot to have a large head, containing every thing else but truth; and perhaps he may have the heart of the animal he describes, as he speaks of men with a view to injure, with an insatiable appetite to detraction from the characters of persons both individually and collectively.

Truth, Sir, is a gem which adds lustre to the character of a writer, if he is exposing injuries and hardships to be redressed; but neither Squibs, nor Satire, can be admired if the subject be false and the intention bad. Both will be deprecated, and viewed with disgust, when they are formed of a tissue of malicious fabrications.

For instance, the Writer in question observes, with a sarcastic and malignant sneer, that Captain D— of the Hussingabad Seebundy Corps attacked a party of Goonds, and that Colonel A. and his Staff, proceeded five or six marches in advance of his Division of the Army, for the purpose of marching out the Cantonments on the Kaunhap; both of which I assure you is nothing more than an attempt to be satirical; nor was the latter necessary, as no ground could be marked out until the approbation of Government was received to a plan which was directed to be forwarded for that purpose on the arrival of the Force at Nagpore. As a specimen of slanderous imputation cast upon our brother Officers of the Madras Establishment, I will quote his own words:—

"They (the Madras Officers) displayed their irritation in rather an ardent manner, by setting fire to, and burning to the ground, most of the Sepoy's huts; and but that they expected a large price for their Bungalows, I have no doubt they would have been treated in the same unceremonious manner."

I am convinced that very few would be found in any Army to ascribe such unworthy motives to our gallant Comrades in Arms, particularly to so large in body as that which composed the Nagpore Subsidiary Force, unless he was influenced by such discreditable principles himself. The losses of the Bungalows to the Madras Officers ought to be a matter of regret, rather than the theme of ill-natured ridicule by the Correspondent of this unpopular Paper, and I feel confident that the observation will be treated by the Madras Officers as it deserves.

It is evident that the new Editor of JOHN BULL must take with his Correspondent particular delight in the Proverb,

"Il aboye tout le monde;"

and it is to be sincerely deplored that the honest name of JOHN BULL should be so maliciously defamed. That character, tho' not always boasting in his judgement between right and wrong, is ever ready to fill the Chair of Justice when it is empty and growing into decay; and there can be little doubt that so long as that Paper (misnamed) continues to advance its present principles, it will soon meet the fate of its late Editor.

Nagpore, February 27, 1822.

VINDICATOR.

Death.

At Berhampore, on the 8th instant, after an illness of a few hours, ELIZA, the Lady of Captain A. SHULHAM, Acting Barrack Master of that Station, most sincerely and deservedly lamented by a circle of friends to whom she had endeared herself by the warmth and kindness of her heart. Her many virtues as a Wife cannot but be held in constant remembrance by her afflicted Husband, and it may be truly said she bore her painful illness, with the most Christian like fortitude and patient resignation to the will of the Almighty Power. Let her Husband and Friends resign themselves to the blessed hope, that she has escaped from a world of troubles to rest on the bosom of her Heavenly Father.

Breaking in Horses.

To the Editor of the Calcutta Journal.

SIR,

The Calcutta Course was given by the Government, I believe, for the use of the Public, with a view to promote their health and comfort by wholesome and agreeable exercise. Whatever therefore obstructs the enjoyment of this privilege granted to us by our benevolent Rulers, ought not to be endured, unless it be something actually required for the exigencies of the public service. I do not think the breaking in of horses, a necessity of this description, and can therefore see no reason why persons taking their evening drive with their families should have their lives endangered by it.

A Gentleman who was taking an airing a few evenings ago was run against by some unruly animals, who as the phrase is, were "breaking in": they in reality nearly broke in to his carriage where he was with his family, in consequence of which the Lady swooned away with fright. Luckily no other serious accident happened. The same person met with an accident of a similar kind not long before.

Upon what pretence do proprietors of horses on whose manageableness they will not venture their own necks, let these animals loose upon the Public to endanger the lives of hundreds? Nay, they cautiously and providently attach vehicles to these animals so worthless that it is no great loss if they are broken regardless at the same time, whether the valuable equipages of others should be dashed to pieces by coming in contact with them or not.

Race-Stand, March 15, 1822.

CENSOR.

India Gazette.

THE INDIA GAZETTE of Monday last, the 11th instant, contains a long Letter signed A LAYMAN, attacking the opinions expressed by the Editor in the Paper of last Week, in a Leading Article on the Trial of the Rev. M. Blacow, and the Editor's Defence of himself. The subject is too much dilated to admit of entire re-publication, but an abstract of some of the positions advanced, the objections, and replies, as far as practicable, may be interesting:

"It is very doubtful (said the Editor) whether Religion has kept pace in improvement with other attainments." And yet (says the LAYMAN) we are told in the very next sentence, "It is gratifying to know that the very general distribution of the Bible among the poor of Europe and the barbarous of other countries, has opened the hitherto sealed fountain of Christianity to thousands of ignorant beings!" To show there is no contradiction here, the Editor in reply says, "We spoke of Religion as a system—for it does not follow that the former is improved, (he might have added "in an equal ratio with other attainments"), although the fountain of Christian research be known to the laity now better than formerly." Again, the "distribution of the Bible," (said the Editor), "has increased the number of Dissenters from the established Church." The LAYMAN flatly contradicts this assertion as "not supported by any one fact." The Bible he affirms, "has always been accessible to every individual of the Church of England for centuries past." (No doubt, if they had the means of procuring, the desire of reading, and the capacity of understanding it.) And although copies of the Bible may be more numerous than formerly, still the time within these two hundred years has never been when one cottage out of ten has been without at least one copy:—To these dogmatical assertions, the Editor rejoins, however, "It is certain that the increase of Bible-readers and of Dissenters have been co-existent. The Bible has not been at all times accessible to the lower orders. We doubt much that a copy of it could be found now in every tenth cottage throughout England, though it is very likely that the Book of Common Prayer might. We further doubt, whether the inhabitants of every tenth cottage could read it. Education so general as to permit of this is only a thing of yesterday." When Henry the Eighth, having quarrelled with the Pope about his wives, first abolished the Roman Catholic Religion in England, it may be questioned whether there were any Dissenters at all. Besides the two great Divisions of Catholics and Protestants, men did not trouble themselves about lesser distinctions: in these days it was dangerous to have any religion but that of the State, and even in the subsequent reign the distinction between a Protestant and an Atheist would hardly attract attention, when the one was proscribed as much as the other under the general appellation of Heretics. But the more general study of the Scriptures is evidently not only collateral with, but the chief cause of the increase of Dissenters. The more men study and go into the mine of a subject they generally find the more grounds of distinction; and the worthies who set up a standard system of Logic, of Chemistry, of Natural Philosophy &c. two or three hundred years ago, would find themselves wonderfully disappointed if they expected them to be implicitly received at the present day; indeed while there is so much diversity in men's views respecting the works of God, we cannot expect to find less in the interpretation of his word.

Saturday, March 16, 1822.

—167—

But to return;—so great an evil does this secession from the Church seem to the LAYMAN, that, says he, if the distribution of the Bible really has that effect “it becomes the bounden duty of every conscientious member of the Church to withdraw their support from Bible Societies and confine themselves entirely to the Society for promoting Christian knowledge.” “A fine proposal truly!” exclaims the EDITOR; “Take away the Shasters and leave the rest to the Pundits! Does not the LAYMAN see that Religion of system and pure Christianity are two different things. State policy is incorporated with the one—the other has no policy at all to recommend it, excepting its honesty, which the best policy.” It is almost incredible that a LAYMAN should make such a proposal: but he evidently mistakes Priestianity for Christianity, and is a mere partisan of the former, while he professes so much zeal for the latter. If, to secure the ascendancy of the English Church, it would be proper to discontinue, if necessary, the spread of the Scriptures, it would be equally proper to prohibit them entirely to the eyes of the vulgar;—as the Popish priests did, by forbidding them to be read in the vulgar Tongue. Thus the Egyptian priests veiled their religion under hieroglyphical symbols, and the Brahmuns shut up theirs in an unknown language. Such is Priestianity all over the world!

This leads to the trial of Samuel Waller for Street-Predaching, which the Editor had characterised as a “scandalous persecution of a dissenting Clergyman before the judgement seat of an ordained Priest.” The LAYMAN maintains it is scandalous to say so; for the prosecution even was not commenced until pains had been taken to make him desist, and it was in no degree a religious persecution for preaching, but it was a civil prosecution for a wilful obstruction of the highway within twenty yards of the church-yard gate on Sunday.” Now this is sophistry, says the Editor; “for gloss it over as he may, the LAYMAN cannot deny but Mr. Waller was put in durance for doing what Paul and Barnabas did before him.” (Yes; and a personage still higher than they). “The Scribes and Pharisees also thought street-preaching a nuisance.” It will surely not be denied that the founders of Christianity were what is now called Street-Preachers; and not only did they preach in the streets and in the vicinity of the temples of the Established Church of those days, but in the Temples themselves. We read of Christ entering into the synagogue and teaching; of entering the very temple, and punishing and rebuking those that defiled that sacred place; of Peter and John preaching in the temple, of Paul preaching in the midst of Mars Hill at Athens, and reasoning with the Jews in the Synagogue at Ephesus: Nay, they were expressly commanded to do so: “What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light: and what ye hear in the ear that preach ye upon the house tops, MATTH. x. 27. Go ye therefore into the highways, and as many as ye shall find, bid to the marriage, xxii. 9. Go ye into the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature.” MARK xv. 15. Are Clergymen of the Church of England not ashamed then to punish a man for obeying the imperative commands of the Founder of Christianity himself, because that happens to be contrary to their system of Priestianity? Who does not see that the alleged obstruction of the highway was a mere pretence, since no proof whatever was adduced that the hearse was compelled to take another road. Well, therefore, might the prosecution be called a hypocritical persecution.

They next come to the case of Mr. Blacow, for whom a LAYMAN puts in the same plea used by the Editor of the JOHN BOLL, and which Advocates often have recourse to for the purpose of bringing a man off for any atrocious act for which no other defence can be made, viz. INSANITY. “Do you think, says he, the unworthy conduct of ten Blacows is to be the criterion of the character of the Church?” The Editor rejoins. “Indeed we are not so unjust; but we think the Church ought to mark her disapprobation of such men in a very intelligible manner. Nay, the Church is bound to do so, by a clause of the xxvi. Article, which expressly says: *It appertaineth to the discipline of the Church that enquiry be made of evil ministers, and that they be accused by those who have knowledge of their offences, and finally being found guilty by just judgment, be deposed.*” What can the Layman reply to this? It is freely admitted that ten black-cows will not render the whole herd sable; but from such an intermixture they may be expected in time to become speckled and spotted like Jacob's cattle. In order to wipe off these blemishes, the Editor very rationally advised thus: “Let the Church express her marked displeasure of such votaries as him, let her lessen her hauteur for other sects—let her members obtrude themselves less than they do in matters foreign to their holy and humble vocation.” In answer to this, “Now, Sir, (says the LAYMAN), by the Church's marked displeasure, you can only mean the deprivation of benefice; and are you an advocate for punishing a man twice for the same offence?” No, Sir, is the Editor's reply; “There are various ways of expressing marked displeasure—such as by public reprimand, for instance. This was not Mr. Blacow's first offence, we have heard of no clerical reproofs that followed. Frailty may be tolerated, and must be tolerated in a Clergyman; but malignity, cold reckless malignity, never. Away with all such wolves from the bosom of the flock!” The punishment of an offence does not necessarily change the nature of the offender: in the

present instance he has not shown any symptoms of contrition, unless it be the hypocritical or crocodile tears shed, or pretended to be shed, on his trial. With his brother Clergymen it is not a question of punishment for that crime; but whether or not the convicted criminal is fit to discharge the sacred functions of a Minister of the Gospel and worthy to continue a member of the Church. Their silent acquiescence must be held as a proof that they approve of his conduct, and think the Reverend Mr. Blacow just a very fit person to support the character of the Church of England! It is not the obnoxious EXAMINER, or the reviled Radical, or the spirited Editor of the INDIA GAZETTE,—but themselves who pronounce this ignominious sentence, from which nothing but a conduct directly opposite can deliver them.

The LAYMAN seems quite indignant at the term, holy and humble vocation.” “I had no idea, says he, that the vocation of a Minister of the Gospel was a humble one; on the contrary I have been used to consider it decidedly the contrary.” What!—a holy and haughty vocation? This is indeed the practice of Priestianity, but not the spirit of Christianity; of that religion whose Founder girt himself with a towel and washed his Disciples' feet; who taught by precept and example that he who wishes to be the highest of all should become the servant of all, and that unless our heart become as that of a little child we cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. Is not this humility? The Editor states that the term was not by him intended to convey any degrading meaning; and indeed in using it he shows that he knows infinitely more of the nature of genuine Christianity than his Correspondent.

The dispute then turns on the emoluments of the Church, a subject on which the LAYMAN seems to feel very sore. The Editor had said “Let her (the Church's) exalted dignitaries share a portion out of their abundance to a distressed people—let a little of the superfluities of their palaces cheer the starved inhabitants of the cottages,—let them be known more for their charity and munificence than their eagerness for tithes, their political subservieny, their judicial severity on the bench &c.” These two pieces of advice the LAYMAN affirms, are “degrading to the open that traced them!” and what is perhaps worse, the sentences embody, he says, “the very worst styles of radical argument.” He asserts in substance that no Prelate ever died rich, and no one family has ever been raised by a Bishopric. This is just such an assertion as none but an anonymous writer would have staked his credit for veracity upon. It pre-supposes an intimate acquaintance with the domestic history of Churchmen, which few LAYMEN possess. “If they amass no riches, (replies the Editor) it is very strange, especially when they receive £20,000 £14,000, £10,000, £6,000, £4,000 and so on (per annum.) The Clergy are not peculiarly distinguished by their hospitality, that is, not more so than the generality of people.” If the Clergy do really always die in virtuous and honourable poverty, it must be viewed as a remarkable phenomenon. According to the testimony of the English Press instead of of being more charitable and munificent than other classes, the case is quite the reverse. Their names are indeed conspicuous in the Subscription List to the Association for suppressing the Liberty of the Press, falsely called Constitutional, and of what is speciously named the Society for the Suppression of Vice; but the public loudly complain that when a subscription is proposed simply for the relief of poverty and wretchedness, very little aid is derived from the Clergy.

It would be too tedious to pursue this subject farther, as in the specimens already given the LAYMAN displays nothing but his own zeal and bitterness, and the weakness of the cause he supports: that is, “the Church of England as it is.” This he has shewn himself wholly inadequate to defend; but those who object to it as a system must not be supposed to attack all its members individually; for it is not the fault of the men but the system which almost necessarily makes them what many of them are, servile tools, using religion as a political engine to promote themselves by serving the interests of a party. And the more the Church assumes a political character, the farther it deviates from that pure Christianity, whose Founder declared that his Kingdom was “not of this world.” If it be impossible to “serve two Masters,” what can we say of those who have forsaken their religious functions and devoted themselves to Mammon? The great body of the English Clergy, those who bear the burden and heat of the day, languish in obscure poverty, from which they can hope to emerge only by that long ladder of promotion whose steps are fawning subservieny and meanness; and if they practise these successfully, they may at last be permitted to lick the dust before the throne of Majesty. This is the great bane of the English Church: it is the best politico-religious engine, perhaps, that could be devised; and it works well. The King by his fiat can excommunicate a Queen as easily as his Holiness the Pope: and not one of the Church will dare to address heaven in her behalf. To serve a political purpose, the most imperative texts are, in effect, erased from the Christian Code. If, with such things staring them in the face, men cannot distinguish between Christianity and Priestianity (as it has been aptly termed) we may expect all sorts of corruptions to creep in once more, and that which was intended to be a blessing to mankind, converted into a scourge and a curse.

Shipping Arrivals.

CALCUTTA.

| Date | Names of Vessels | Flags | Commanders | From Whence | Left |
|---------|------------------|---------|-------------|-------------|---------|
| Mar. 15 | Eleanor | British | T. Streeter | Madras | Feb. 26 |
| 15 | John Barry | British | R. Dobson | Sidney | Dec. 27 |

MADRAS.

| Date | Names of Vessels | Flags | Commanders | From Whence | Left |
|---------|------------------|---------|----------------|-------------|---------|
| Feb. 27 | Ida | British | P. Lurned | Negapatam | Feb. 17 |
| 27 | H.M.S. Samarang | British | J. A. Campbell | Trincomalie | — |
| March 1 | Bark George | British | J. Poulson | Calcutta | Feb. 21 |

Shipping Departures.

CALCUTTA.

| Date | Names of Vessels | Flags | Commanders | Destination |
|---------|--------------------|---------|-----------------|----------------|
| Mar. 13 | Conde do Rio Pardo | Port. | B. J. Botelho | Macao |
| 13 | Favorita | British | T. Heming | Padang |
| 14 | Catharine | British | G. Wallace | Isle of France |
| 14 | Anna Robertson | British | W. Clark | South America |
| 14 | Barretta Junior | Port. | V. J. Fernandes | Macao |

MADRAS.

| Date | Names of Vessels | Flags | Commanders | Destination |
|---------|------------------|---------|-------------|-------------|
| Feb. 26 | Britannia | British | W. Sooball | Calcutta |
| 28 | Albion | British | C. Weller | London |
| 28 | Kingston | British | W. A. Bowen | London |
| 28 | Reliance | British | M. Pike | Cannanore |
| 28 | Eclipse | British | J. Stewart | London |

The *PENELOPE* (French) arrived off Calcutta on Thursday last. The *Brig HASTINGS*, Captain P. Butler, for Penang, Malacca, and Singapore, is expected to sail in a day or two.

Nautical Notices.

Madras, March 1, 1822.—The *BARROSA* and *FLORENTIA*, Chartered Ships, are hourly expected from the Northward, they left Calcutta early in the last month. His Majesty's new Ship *SAMARANG*, Captain Campbell, came in on Wednesday morning from Trincomalie. She will carry Packets for the Isle of France and England, and is expected to sail about Tuesday next. Commissioner Upton and Captain Corry, go home by this opportunity in consequence of ill-health.

The Honorable Company's Chartered Ships *ALBION* and *KINGSTON*, sailed at day-light yesterday morning. *Passengers per ALBION*.—Mrs. Gray, Mrs. Frances, Mrs. C. Smith, Captain J. Watson, 6th Regiment of Native Infantry, Lieutenant and Brevet Captain H. Smith, 1st Regiment of Native Infantry, Lieutenant R. Dunmore, 8th Regiment of Native Infantry, Mr. J. Johnson, Mr. Vernon, Mr. Arthur, and Mr. A. Connell, Merchant. *Children*: Misses E. Shakspeare, M. E. Gray, F. Gray, and E. J. Gray; Masters R. W. Gray, O. Gray, and Arthur. *Passengers per KINGSTON*.—Mrs. Oakes, Henry Oakes, Esq. Mr. William, Mr. B. Knott, and Mr. Henry Oakes.

The *RELANCE* sailed on Wednesday evening for the Malabar Coast. The *ECLIPSE* sailed last evening for Colombo and England.—*Courier*.

Bombay, February 23, 1822.—The *SARAH*, Captain Norton, for London, will sail, we are informed, to-morrow. The Packets to be sent by her are to be closed at the Post Office this evening. The *LORD CASTLEREAGH*, Captain Briggs, is to sail hence for London on the 2d March.

By letters from Point de Galle we learn that the *SARAH*, Thacker, arrived there on the 28th of January, and was to have sailed again on the following day.—*Courier*.

Birth.

At Berhampore, on the 13th instant, the Lady of Lieutenant A. W. GRAY, of His Majesty's 17th Regiment, of a Son and Heir.

Deaths.

On the 14th instant, at her Residence at Allipore, Mrs. C. R. BARWELL, aged 35 years, a Lady whose amiable and superior qualities of heart and mind, secured the esteem of all those who were intimately acquainted with her, and rendered her the idol of a devoted and truly afflicted Husband.

On the 14th instant, at Mrs. Broder's Seminary, of a Typhus Fever, Miss SARAH ELIZA RADCLIFFE, aged 16 years.

On the 11th instant, Mr. CONSTANTINE MENDES, of Calcutta, many years Writer to the Judge and Magistrate of Moorshedabad, after a long and lingering illness, leaving a family of five Daughters, wholly unprovided for to lament his loss.

Commercial Reports.

(From the Calcutta Exchange Price Current of Thursday last.)

| | Rs. As. | Rs. As. |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|
| Cotton, Cutchoura,..... per maund | 13 12 a | 14 4 |
| Grain, Rice, Patna,..... | 2 0 a | 2 2 |
| Patchery, 1st,..... | 2 4 a | 2 8 |
| Ditto, 2d,..... | 1 12 a | 1 14 |
| Moongy, 1st,..... | 1 7 a | 1 8 |
| Ditto, 2d,..... | 1 2 a | 1 5 |
| Ballum, 1st,..... | 1 5 a | 1 7 |
| Wheat, Dooda,..... | 1 1 a | 1 2 |
| Gram, Patna,..... | 0 15 a | 1 0 |
| Dhall, Urruhr, good,..... | 1 5 a | 1 6 |
| Indigo, Ordinary fine blue,..... | 245 0 a | 255 0 |
| Fine purple and violet,..... | 235 0 a | 240 0 |
| Ordinary ditto,..... | 205 0 a | 215 0 |
| Dull blue,..... | 185 0 a | 195 0 |
| Inferior purple and violet,..... | 180 0 a | 190 0 |
| Strong copper,..... | 200 0 a | 210 0 |
| Ordinary ditto,..... | 160 0 a | 170 0 |
| Osde ordinary,..... | 145 0 a | 155 0 |
| Saltpetre, Culme, 1st sort,..... | 5 0 a | 5 12 |
| 2d sort,..... | 3 12 a | 4 4 |
| 3d sort,..... | 3 8 a | 3 10 |

Indigo.—The sales in this during the week have not been extensive, the principal holders are shipping largely for Europe, and it is probable this market will soon be pretty well cleared. The Arabs and Americans may now be considered out of the market. The importation this season exhibits a considerable increase on the importation of last year, to the same period, but the demand in England by the last accounts seemed rapidly on the increase, and the price advancing, the stock said to be in that market, to meet the crop of this season was unusually small.

Opium.—We have heard of no transactions in this since the Honorable Company's sale of the 1st instant, some of the small holders have been offering Patna at 4150, and 4210 has been refused for Benares.

Cotton.—Still continues dull, the sales in it during the week have been very limited—at Mirzapoor it also continues flat, and the price rather on the decline—on the 6th of March, new Cutchoura was quoted at 17-1 per local maund, and a difficulty in effecting sales. At Bogwagolah on the 9th of March, new Cutchoura was stated at 15-8 to 15-12 per maund—sales during the week 8,500 maunds, all for country consumption—stock 29,000 maunds.

Pepper.—Keeps steady at our quotations, and holders do not seem anxious to call.

Spelter and Tutchnague.—Continues steady at our quotations, the former is now getting more in vogue among the natives, and will most likely soon, for general purposes, be preferred to the latter.

Sugar.—Continues dull, but no alteration can be stated in prices.

Saltpetre.—Seems declining in price, and in little demand.

Piece Goods.—Have lately been a good deal looked after, principally for the South American markets.

Grain.—Has been in brisk demand during the week.

Freight to London.—May be rated at £6 to £7 per Ton, and little or no Tonnage obtainable at present.

Exports from Calcutta from the 1st to the 28th of February 1822.

| | |
|------------------------------|-------|
| Sugar, to Liverpool,..... | 11075 |
| Saltpetre, to London,..... | 2637 |
| Liverpool,..... | 769 |
| Piece Goods, to London,..... | 18007 |
| Silk, to London,..... | 45 |
| Indigo, to London,..... | 4294 |
| Liverpool,..... | 1877 |

Importation of Bullion, from the 1st to the 28th of February 1822.

| | SILVER Sa. Rs. | GOLD Sa. Rs. | TOTAL Sa. Rs. |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| From 1st to the 28th of Feb... | 27,00,225 | 20,775 | 27,21,000 |
| Previously this year,..... | 30,89,353 | 3,41,964 | 34,31,317 |
| Total,..... | 57,89,578 | 2,62,739 | 61,52,317 |

The Exchange is taken at the Custom House rate, viz. 10 Rupees to the £ Sterling, and 2½ Rupees per Spanish Dollar.